

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

HOMER E. HOSKINS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SECURITAS,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

1:15-cv-00374-SEB-DML

**Entry Denying Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, Dismissing Complaint,
and Directing Entry of Final Judgment**

I. Motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*

The plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* [dkt. 2] is **denied** because it is illegible and inadequate to show his entitlement to proceed without the prepayment of the fees in this action.

II. Dismissal of the Complaint

The complaint is subject to the screening requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This statute requires the Court to dismiss a complaint or claim within a complaint if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim for relief, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

"Subject-matter jurisdiction is the first question in every case, and if the court concludes that it lacks jurisdiction it must proceed no further." *State of Illinois v. City of Chicago*, 137 F.3d 474, 478 (7th Cir. 1998). "Congress has conferred subject matter jurisdiction on the district courts only in cases that raise a federal question and cases in which there is diversity of citizenship among the parties." *Smart v. Local 702 Intern. Broth. Of Elec. Workers*, 562 F.3d 798, 802 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331-32). The complaint does not set forth any basis for this Court's


jurisdiction, nor is there any discernible federal jurisdiction for the plaintiff's claim. The plaintiff alleges defendant Securitas failed to provide him with protection. The complaint fails to state any type of constitutional civil rights claim. The complaint also does not allege that the plaintiff was discriminated against on any basis that is protected under federal law. Therefore, the Court appears to lack subject matter jurisdiction over this action. The complaint is therefore dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

III. Distribution of this Entry

The Court notes that the plaintiff has consistently failed to provide a valid address to the Court, so this Entry and Judgment will not be placed in the mail. *See* No. 1:15-cv-304-RLY-DKL (March 4, 2015). As he often does, he may pick up a copy of this Entry in the Clerk's Office, Room 105 of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, 46 East Ohio Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

03/06/2015


SARAH EVANS BARKER, JUDGE
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

Homer E. Hoskins, For Pick Up In Clerk's Office, Room 105 Courthouse

Note to Clerk: Processing this document requires actions in addition to docketing and distribution.